Evaluative Research and Evaluation Capacity Building

Program Solicitation

NSF-02-34

DIVISION OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND COMMUNICATION
DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL DUE DATES(S) (*required*): April 1, 2002
March 1 of each year starting 2003

FULL PROPOSAL TARGET DATE(S): June 10, 2002, June 1 of each year starting 2003

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The National Science Foundation promotes and advances scientific progress in the United States by competitively awarding grants and cooperative agreements for research and education in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

To get the latest information about program deadlines, to download copies of NSF publications, and to access abstracts of awards, visit the NSF Web Site at:

http://www.nsf.gov

- **Location:** 4201 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22230
- **For General Information (NSF Information Center):** (703) 292-5111
- **TDD (for the hearing-impaired):** (703) 292-5090
- **To Order Publications or Forms:**

  Send an e-mail to: pubs@nsf.gov

  or telephone: (301) 947-2722
- **To Locate NSF Employees:** (703) 292-5111

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

GENERAL INFORMATION

Program Title: Evaluative Research and Evaluation Capacity Building

Synopsis of Program: The Evaluation program seeks proposals that offer unique approaches to evaluation practice in the generation of knowledge for the education community and for broad policymaking within the research and education enterprise. Successful proposals may focus on evaluations of multiple education programs or projects with similar objectives, may bundle several programs or projects together to examine major science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education themes, may focus on various facets or common elements among programs or projects, or may focus on the development of capacity within the evaluation field.

Cognizant Program Officer(s):

- Conrad Katzenmeyer, Senior Program Director, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Communication, 855, telephone: 703-292-5150, e-mail: ckatzenm@nsf.gov.
- Bernice Anderson, Program Director, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communciation, 855, telephone: 703-292-5151, e-mail: banderso@nsf.gov.
- James Dietz, Associate Program Director, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication, 855, telephone: 703-292-5156, e-mail: jdietz@nsf.gov.
- Larry Suter, Statistician Program Director, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication, 855, telephone: 703-292-5144, e-mail: lsuter@nsf.gov.
- Elmima C. Johnson, Senior Staff Associate for Program Assessment, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication, 855, telephone: 703-292-5137, e-mail: ejohnson@nsf.gov.

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number(s):

- 47.076 --- Education and Human Resources

ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

- **Organization Limit:** None
- **PI Eligibility Limit:** None
- **Limit on Number of Proposals:** None

AWARD INFORMATION

- **Anticipated Type of Award:** Standard or Continuing Grant
- **Estimated Number of Awards:** 5-10 Awards
- **Anticipated Funding Amount:** Approximately $3 million in FY 2002, and greater thereafter, contingent upon the availability of funds.

PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- **Preliminary Proposals:** Submission of Preliminary Proposals is required. Please see the full program announcement/solicitation for further information.
- **Full Proposals:** Deviations From Standard Preparation Guidelines
    - The program announcement/solicitation contains deviations from the standard Grant Proposal Guide (GPG) proposal preparation guidelines. Please see the full program announcement/solicitation for further information.

B. Budgetary Information

- **Cost Sharing Requirements:** Cost Sharing is not required.
- **Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations:** None
- **Other Budgetary Limitations:** Not Applicable.

C. Deadline/Target Dates

- **Letters of Intent (*optional*):** None
- **Preliminary Proposals (*required*):** April 1, 2002, March 1 of each year starting 2003
- **Full Proposal Target Date(s):** June 10, 2002, June 1 of each year starting 2003

D. FastLane Requirements

- **FastLane Submission:** Required
- **FastLane Contact(s):**
    - DeMonica Parks, Program Specialist, EHR, REC, 855, telephone: 703-292-5167, e-mail: dparks@nsf.gov.

PROPOSAL REVIEW INFORMATION

- **Merit Review Criteria:** National Science Board approved criteria apply.

AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

- **Award Conditions:** Standard NSF award conditions apply.
- **Reporting Requirements:** Standard NSF reporting requirements apply.

I. INTRODUCTION

Evaluation has gained currency throughout government and within the education enterprise as a part of a move toward greater accountability, oversight, and management of public resources. Until this time, however, evaluation has not been fully utilized as a research approach to generate knowledge about effective programmatic and policy features and strategies. While the community of evaluators who focus on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education remains small, the demands on it are growing. This solicitation is designed to support compelling evaluative studies that build the knowledge base about effective STEM education policy and practice, and to increase the size and capacity of the evaluation community to respond to evolving challenges in STEM education.

The Role of NSF and EHR

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is charged with promoting the health and vitality of the Nation's scientific and engineering research and education enterprises. As one part of that mission, the Directorate for Education and Human Resources (EHR) supports activities to improve the quality of STEM education at all levels, throughout the fifty states and US territories. For a complete list of EHR programs, consult http://www.ehr.nsf.gov/prog.asp. For a complete list of NSF programs, see http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2000/nsf002/apx_a.htm. Empirical investigations into what strategies work in educational improvement, where, and under what conditions, are crucial to NSF's mission and to the nation as a whole. As part of EHR's current mandate, the Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication (REC) is working to advance the state of knowledge about STEM education and learning through programs in research and evaluation. The *Research on Learning and Education* (ROLE) program seeks to capitalize on important developments in a variety of fields related to human learning and education. The *Interagency Education Research Initiative* (IERI) focuses on large-scale studies and the transfer of research findings to educational practice. With this solicitation, REC is adding a focus on evaluative research and evaluation capacity building.

Background-The Evaluation Program

The primary mission of the Evaluation program is to oversee the design and conduct of EHR program evaluations. The program also gathers evaluative information for use in program management and improvement, and acts to communicate evaluation findings to the field. REC has operated a long-standing process of conducting third-party program evaluations under contract. The purpose of these program evaluations is to provide summative and formative information regarding the performance of EHR's programs and other education programs operated throughout the agency. In addition, most projects funded by EHR programs are required to have project evaluation components that assist individual principal investigators in developing and managing effective STEM education activities. Funds for these activities are normally provided by the EHR program that makes the project award.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This solicitation is not intended to replace or duplicate any of these existing third-party contract activities or the evaluations that individual projects may conduct. This solicitation is designed to attract proposals in the areas of evaluative research studies and evaluation capacity building, in order to advance knowledge and capability in STEM education.

I. Evaluative Research Studies

REC seeks proposals that offer unique approaches to evaluation practice resulting in knowledge generation for the STEM education community and for broad policymaking within the research and education enterprise. Successful proposals may focus on comparative evaluation of multiple STEM education programs or projects with similar objectives, may bundle several programs or projects together to examine major STEM education themes, or may focus on various facets or common elements among programs or projects.

In this solicitation, three thematic areas are eligible subjects of evaluative research proposals: *instructional workforce, technology in support of learning,* and *partnerships for education*. REC expects to support multiple evaluative research studies within each of these areas with the intent that knowledge will be built through the diversity of perspectives, methods, and approaches to these problems. REC expects that these evaluative research studies will serve as innovative and exemplary models for the STEM education research and evaluation communities at large. Increased attention will therefore be paid to the coordination and exchange of information and ideas among the evaluation teams supported under this solicitation.

Proposals whose main purpose is to evaluate a particular program or project are not eligible. The focus of proposals must be on generating knowledge and/or capacity in the field, not in providing a service to individual organizations that operate those programs or projects. The objective of the evaluative research should be to expand the understanding of effective educational practices, policies, procedures, and outcomes that might be adopted within the STEM fields.

The STEM education programs (and the projects funded under them) of NSF and other funding organizations may be the subject of such proposals. However, REC will not support the duplication of completed or ongoing program or project evaluations. See http://www.ehr.nsf.gov/EHR/rec for a list of past and current program evaluation activities. Programs or projects that have previously been evaluated may be the subject of a proposal if they are part of a broader evaluative research design that is intended to address a substantially different knowledge goal than the previous evaluation.

Instructional Workforce

Numerous approaches to developing an instructional workforce with a deep understanding of STEM content, pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment are currently being implemented in schools, school districts, universities and colleges, and in other settings. Issues related to the instructional workforce includes the education of preservice k-12 teachers, and the professional development of k-12 teachers and higher education faculty and instructors. Approaches differ in their goals, settings, delivery mechanisms, and conceptual models of change. REC is interested in building greater evaluative research knowledge about the effectiveness of the various models, approaches, and strategies. The following broad examples are provided for illustrative purposes only. Applicants are encouraged to develop focused evaluative research questions in these or possibly other areas of relevancy to the instructional workforce theme.

- Investigations aimed at better understanding the effectiveness of various approaches to the induction or mentoring of newly hired teachers and faculty during their first years of teaching.

- Studies of the effectiveness of various approaches to alternative certification for teachers.

- Studies of the effectiveness of various models of teacher enhancement, with attention to understanding what features or strategies seem to work in which settings.

- Studies of how different approaches to the preparation of preservice STEM teachers and inservice professional development affects teaching, student learning, and achievement.

- Studies of various innovations in the pedagogical preparation of future faculty and instructors (including graduate teaching assistants) and how well they work.

- Studies focusing on the development, testing, and use of measures, theories, and models for evaluating the impacts of preservice and inservice instructor development.

Technology in Support of Learning

Educational technologies in various forms are being introduced and implemented in STEM learning environments at an increasing pace. Evaluative questions focusing on the effective use of educational technologies, the complex nature of the links between effective use and student achievement, and a greater understanding of the nature of technology as an agent of change in education and learning environments are of central importance to the field and policymaking in general. The following broad examples are provided for illustrative purposes only. Applicants are encouraged to develop focused evaluative research questions in these or possibly other areas of relevancy to the technology theme.

- Studies of the effects of large-scale programs of implementation of technology (including the professional development of instructors) on student learning and achievement.

- Studies weighing the cost and benefits of technology in applied, diverse settings and within different educational contexts (e.g. rural and distance learning situations; high and low socioeconomic school districts).

- Studies focusing on the development, testing, and use of measures, theories, and models for evaluating the impacts of educational technology.

Partnerships for Education

In recent years, increased focus has been placed on the role of collaborative partnerships in educational change and improvement at all levels of STEM education. These partnerships operate at different levels of the education system, include various organizational types (e.g., schools, associations, institutions of higher education, industry, informal learning organizations, and government agencies) playing different roles, and are expected to result in different ends. REC is interested in generating greater knowledge-drawn from multiple disciplinary and cross-disciplinary approaches-of the factors that affect the success or failure of these partnerships; the effectiveness of the many models or approaches taken to partnering; and their impact on changing large-scale systems of education as well as on individual schools, institutions of higher education, and learning environments in general. The following broad examples are provided for illustrative purposes only. Applicants are encouraged to develop focused evaluative research questions in these or possibly other areas of relevancy to the partnerships theme.

- Exploratory or descriptive evaluation on the diversity of organizations that serve as partners, the roles they play, the nature of the partnering mechanism or arrangement, and the lessons to be drawn from these experiences.
- Studies exploring the role of partnerships in effecting change in educational systems and on educational institutions.
- Comparative studies of partnerships that are considered to be successes and/or failures.
- The development, testing, and use of credible measurement tools to document and assess the implementation and impacts of educational partnerships, drawing on multiple disciplinary fields.
- The development of various theoretical frameworks and models to guide evaluation of partnership projects, with an emphasis on methods for addressing cause and effect.

II. Evaluation Capacity Building

The Evaluation program is acting to increase the capacity of the field to conduct high quality, innovative, useful, and credible STEM education evaluation studies. In the past, the program supported projects for training Ph.D. evaluators, for summer workshops and internships that provide intensive evaluation experiences, and for short courses aimed at building skills. The program has also supported the development of a number of resources for evaluators including manuals for conducting project evaluation (*The User Friendly Handbooks*); an electronic library of evaluation instruments, plans, and reports (the Online Evaluation Resource Library-OERL, http://www.oerl.sri.com); and a web-based directory of evaluators (http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr).

In this solicitation, two areas are eligible subjects of evaluation capacity building proposals: *advancing the state-of-the-art in evaluation* and *enhancing the capability and infrastructure.*

Advancing The State-of-The-Art In Evaluation

Public demands on improving quality and access to STEM education are requiring new evaluation approaches and methods. In this solicitation, REC will support projects designed to advance the state-of-the-art of evaluation by developing innovative tools, models, theories, and techniques that will assist the field in addressing questions of complex causality, attribution of cause and effect, and the impacts of various educational interventions on educational systems and learning environments. The following broad examples are provided for illustrative purposes only. Applicants are encouraged to develop focused projects in these or possibly other areas of relevancy to this theme.

- The synthesis of existing research results from multi-disciplinary perspectives, the development of meta-analyses, and the organization of conferences to seek clarity and consensus among disparate bodies of literature on methods for evaluating STEM education activities.
- The development of methods that might increase the validity and reliability of measures, address issues of complex causality, and/or enhance the ability of evaluators to make causal or attributional statements.
- The development or refinement of conceptual or theoretical frameworks for innovative evaluation design of STEM education programs.
- The development of cost effective approaches to evaluation or approaches that reduce the time required to obtain credible and reliable preliminary results.
- The creation of new models and approaches for disseminating STEM evaluation findings and methods to various stakeholder audiences.
- The development of new methods for evaluating complex programs in STEM, including the creation of mathematical models, qualitative or multidisciplinary methods, and measurement techniques.

Enhancing Capability and Infrastructure

REC will support projects designed to enhance the capability and infrastructure of the education field to conduct evaluations through training, the development of evaluation knowledge and skills, and through the creation of evaluation resources useful for the field in general. The following broad examples are provided for illustrative purposes only. Applicants are encouraged to develop focused projects in these or possibly other areas of relevancy to this theme.

- The development of professional communities focusing on specific innovative evaluation approaches and practices via workshops, and electronic networks, or by other means.
- The compilation, critique, and dissemination of resources of information useful for evaluation practices.

III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

The categories of proposers identified in the Grant Proposal Guide are eligible to submit proposals under this program announcement/solicitation. Synergistic collaboration among researchers, evaluators, and collaboration or partnerships with other educational institutions (including schools or school systems), scientific organizations, industry or government laboratories is encouraged when appropriate. Due to the limited availability of funds, prospective applicants are strongly urged to contact one of the program officers listed at the end of this document for guidance.

IV. AWARD INFORMATION

Evaluative research and capacity building projects may receive up to 3 years of funding not to exceed $1.5 million in total award size. Depending on the availability of funding, between 5 and 10 proposals may be selected for support in each of the two annual funding cycles. REC will consider planning, workshop and exploratory research grants up to $100,000 each. No predetermined allocation for funding applies across the priority areas of this solicitation.

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

Preliminary Proposals:

Preliminary proposals are required prior to submission of full proposals on or before the preliminary proposal deadline date. (Note: Full proposals that have been declined may be resubmitted within two deadline cycles of declination without further preliminary proposal submission. Similarly, a formal proposal may be submitted within two deadline cycles of the submission of the underlying preliminary proposal deadline.) Preliminary proposals should include the following:

1. A Cover Sheet (NSF Form 1207); the dollar request field should remain blank.
2. A Project Summary Form that provides a brief synopsis of the proposed project.
3. A Project Description of five to seven pages; The Project Description describes the essential features and anticipated impact of the proposal. In particular, proposers should:

- Describe the evaluative study (and underlying activity) or capacity-building issue(s) proposed, the proposed methods of effort, and the guiding, relevant theoretical frameworks;
- Describe the strategic contribution of the research to NSF's education goals and specific evaluation goals;
- Identify the project team of scholars, learners, teachers, faculty and scientists;
- Describe the advanced technologies, if any, that the project will use;
- Outline the conjectures or hypotheses that are to be tested, the proof-of-concept evidence that will be gathered, and the anticipated impact on different learner populations; and
- Provide on the final page of the Project Description a summary of estimated project costs. Preliminary proposals that omit Project Descriptions or that simply recapitulate a Project Summary page do not satisfy preliminary proposal requirements under this Program.

4. Provide brief biographical sketches (not to exceed one page each) for key project personnel.

No other forms should be submitted for preliminary proposals. Signed and separately mailed cover sheets are not required for preliminary proposals. NSF program staff members review preliminary proposals; where appropriate, the review will include staff from other NSF divisions or external experts. Review of preliminary proposals, and communication back to the proposer, may take as long as seven weeks. The preliminary proposal review is not a factor in the review of a subsequent full proposal. NSF typically returns funding decisions within six months of formal proposal submission.

Full Proposal:

Proposals submitted in response to this program announcement/solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the NSF *Grant Proposal Guide* (GPG). The complete text of the GPG is available electronically on the NSF Web Site at: http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?gpg. Paper copies of the GPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (301) 947-2722 or by e-mail from pubs@nsf.gov.

Proposals may be submitted that include studies of one or more NSF or other (non-NSF) programs. Proposals that involve collections of data from NSF programs or projects or should be discussed with appropriate NSF program officials. Proposals that include the collection of data from non-NSF programs should include appropriate letters of support.

Proposers are reminded to identify the program solicitation number (NSF-02-34) in the program announcement/solicitation block on the proposal Cover Sheet (NSF Form 1207). Compliance with this requirement is critical to determining the relevant proposal processing guidelines. Failure to submit this information may delay processing.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost sharing is not required in proposals submitted under this Program Solicitation.

Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations: None

C. Deadline/Target Dates

Proposals must be submitted by the following date(s):

Preliminary Proposals (*required*): April 1, 2002, March 1 of each year starting 2003
Full Proposals: June 10, 2002, June 1 of each year starting 2003

D. FastLane Requirements

Proposers are required to prepare and submit all proposals for this Program Solicitation through the FastLane system. Detailed instructions for proposal preparation and submission via FastLane are available at: http://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/a1/newstan.htm. For FastLane user support, call 1-800-673-6188 or e-mail fastlane@nsf.gov.

Submission of Electronically Signed Cover Sheets. The Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) must electronically sign the proposal Cover Sheet to submit the required proposal certifications (see Chapter II, Section C of the Grant Proposal Guide for a listing of the certifications). The AOR must provide the required certifications within five working days following the electronic submission of the proposal. Further instructions regarding this process are available on the FastLane website at: http://www.fastlane.nsf.gov.

VI. PROPOSAL REVIEW INFORMATION

A. NSF Proposal Review Process

Reviews of proposals submitted to NSF are solicited from peers with expertise in the substantive area of the proposed research or education project. These reviewers are selected by Program Officers charged with the oversight of the review process. NSF invites the proposer to suggest, at the time of submission, the names of appropriate or inappropriate reviewers. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no conflicts with the proposer. Special efforts are made to recruit reviewers from non-academic institutions, minority-serving institutions, or adjacent disciplines to that principally addressed in the proposal.

Proposals will be reviewed against the following general review criteria established by the National Science Board. Following each criterion are potential considerations that the reviewer may employ in the evaluation. These are suggestions and not all will apply to any given proposal. Proposers are reminded that both the intellectual merit and the broader impacts of the work to be accomplished should be addressed. While reviewers are expected to address both merit review criteria, each reviewer will be asked to address only considerations that are relevant to the proposal and for which he/she is qualified to make judgements.

What is the intellectual merit of the proposed activity?
How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields? How well qualified is the proposer (individual or team) to conduct the project? (If appropriate, the reviewer will comment on the quality of the prior work.) To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative and original concepts? How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Is there sufficient access to resources?

What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?
How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while promoting teaching, training, and learning? How well does the proposed activity broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, disability, geographic, etc.)? To what extent will it enhance the infrastructure for research and education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships? Will the results be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding? What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society?

Principal Investigators should address the following elements in their proposal to provide reviewers with the information necessary to respond fully to both of the above-described NSF merit review criteria. NSF staff will give these elements careful consideration in making funding decisions.

Integration of Research and Education

One of the principal strategies in support of NSF's goals is to foster integration of research and education through the programs, projects, and activities it supports at academic and research institutions. These institutions provide abundant opportunities where individuals may concurrently assume responsibilities as researchers, educators, and students and where all can engage in joint efforts that infuse education with the excitement of discovery and enrich research through the diversity of learning perspectives.

Integrating Diversity into NSF Programs, Projects, and Activities

Broadening opportunities and enabling the participation of all citizens -- women and men, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities -- is essential to the health and vitality of science and engineering. NSF is committed to this principle of diversity and deems it central to the programs, projects, and activities it considers and supports.

A summary rating and accompanying narrative will be completed and submitted by each reviewer. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers, are sent to the Principal Investigator/Project Director by the Program Director. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

B. Review Protocol and Associated Customer Service Standard

All proposals are carefully reviewed by at least three other persons outside NSF who are experts in the particular field represented by the proposal. Proposals submitted in response to this announcement/solicitation will be reviewed by Mail and/or Panel Review.

Reviewers will be asked to formulate a recommendation to either support or decline each proposal. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.

NSF is striving to be able to tell applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months for 70 percent of proposals. The time interval begins on the date of receipt. The interval ends when the Division Director accepts the Program Officer's recommendation.

In all cases, after programmatic approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding will be forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements for review of business, financial, and policy implications and the processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. Proposers are cautioned that only a Grants and Agreements Officer may make commitments, obligations or awards on behalf of NSF or authorize the expenditure of funds. No commitment on the part of NSF should be inferred from technical or budgetary discussions with a NSF Program Officer. A Principal Investigator or organization that makes financial or personnel commitments in the absence of a grant or cooperative agreement signed by the NSF Grants and Agreements Officer does so at its own risk.

VII. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Notification of the Award

Notification of the award is made to *the submitting organization* by a Grants Officer in the Division of Grants and Agreements. Organizations whose proposals are declined will be advised as promptly as possible by the cognizant NSF Program Division administering the program. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including the identity of the reviewer, will be provided automatically to the Principal Investigator. (See section VI.A. for additional information on the review process.)

B. Award Conditions

An NSF award consists of: (1) the award letter, which includes any special provisions applicable to the award and any numbered amendments thereto; (2) the budget, which indicates the amounts, by categories of expense, on which NSF has based its support (or otherwise communicates any specific approvals or disapprovals of proposed expenditures); (3) the proposal referenced in the award letter; (4) the applicable award conditions, such as Grant General Conditions (NSF-GC-1)* or Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) Terms and Conditions;* and (5) any announcement or other NSF issuance that may be incorporated by reference in the award letter. Cooperative agreement awards also are administered in accordance with NSF Cooperative Agreement Terms and Conditions (CA-1). Electronic mail notification is the preferred way to transmit NSF awards to organizations that have electronic mail capabilities and have requested such notification from the Division of Grants and Agreements.

*These documents may be accessed electronically on NSF's Web site at http://www.nsf.gov/home/grants/grants_gac.htm. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (301) 947-2722 or by e-mail from pubs@nsf.gov.

More comprehensive information on NSF Award Conditions is contained in the NSF *Grant Policy Manual* (GPM) Chapter II, available electronically on the NSF Web site at http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?gpm. The GPM is also for sale through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office (GPO), Washington, DC 20402. The telephone number at GPO for subscription information is (202) 512-1800. The GPM may be ordered through the GPO Web site at http://www.gpo.gov.

C. Reporting Requirements

For all multi-year grants (including both standard and continuing grants), the PI must submit an annual project report to the cognizant Program Officer at least 90 days before the end of the current budget period.

Within 90 days after the expiration of an award, the PI also is required to submit a final project report. Approximately 30 days before expiration, NSF will send a notice to remind the PI of the requirement to file the final project report. Failure to provide final technical reports delays NSF review and processing of pending proposals for that PI. PIs should examine the formats of the required reports in advance to assure availability of required data.

NSF has implemented an electronic project reporting system, available through FastLane. This system permits electronic submission and updating of project reports, including information on project participants (individual and organizational), activities and findings, publications, and other specific products and contributions. PIs will not be required to re-enter information previously provided, either with a proposal or in earlier updates using the electronic system.

VIII. CONTACTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

General inquiries regarding Evaluative Research and Evaluation Capacity Building should be made to:

- Conrad Katzenmeyer, Senior Program Director, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Communication, 855, telephone: 703-292-5150, e-mail: ckatzenm@nsf.gov.

- Bernice Anderson, Program Director, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communciation, 855, telephone: 703-292-5151, e-mail: banderso@nsf.gov.

- James Dietz, Associate Program Director, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication, 855, telephone: 703-292-5156, e-mail: jdietz@nsf.gov.

- Larry Suter, Statistician Program Director, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication, 855, telephone: 703-292-5144, e-mail: lsuter@nsf.gov.

- Elmima C. Johnson, Senior Staff Associate for Program Assessment, EHR/REC, Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication, 855, telephone: 703-292-5137, e-mail: ejohnson@nsf.gov.

For questions related to the use of FastLane, contact:

- DeMonica Parks, Program Specialist, EHR, REC, 855, telephone: 703-292-5167, e-mail: dparks@nsf.gov.

IX. OTHER PROGRAMS OF INTEREST

The NSF *Guide to Programs* is a compilation of funding for research and education in science, mathematics, and engineering. The NSF *Guide to Programs* is available electronically at http://www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?gp. General descriptions of NSF programs, research areas, and eligibility information for proposal submission are provided in each chapter.

Many NSF programs offer announcements or solicitations concerning specific proposal requirements. To obtain additional information about these requirements, contact the appropriate NSF program offices. Any changes in NSF's fiscal year programs occurring after press time for the *Guide to Programs* will be announced in the NSF E-Bulletin, which is updated daily on the NSF web site at http://www.nsf.gov/home/ebulletin, and in individual program announcements/solicitations. Subscribers can also sign up for NSF's Custom News Service (http://www.nsf.gov/home/cns/start.htm) to be notified of new funding opportunities that become available.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The National Science Foundation (NSF) funds research and education in most fields of science and engineering. Awardees are wholly responsible for conducting their project activities and preparing the results for publication. Thus, the Foundation does not assume responsibility for such findings or their interpretation.

NSF welcomes proposals from all qualified scientists, engineers and educators. The Foundation strongly encourages women, minorities and persons with disabilities to compete fully in its programs. In accordance with Federal statutes, regulations and NSF policies, no person on grounds of race, color, age, sex, national origin or disability shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving financial assistance from NSF (unless otherwise specified in the eligibility requirements for a particular program).

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASED) provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities (investigators and other staff, including student research assistants) to work on NSF-supported projects. See the program announcement/solicitation for further information.

The National Science Foundation has Telephonic Device for the Deaf (TDD) and Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) capabilities that enable individuals with hearing impairments to communicate with the Foundation about NSF programs, employment or general information. TDD may be accessed at (703) 292-5090, FIRS at 1-800-877-8339.

The National Science Foundation is committed to making all of the information we publish easy to understand. If you have a suggestion about how to improve the clarity of this document or other NSF-published materials, please contact us at plainlanguage@nsf.gov.

PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENTS

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; project reports submitted by awardees will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to applicant institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies needing information as part of the review process or in order to coordinate programs; and to another Federal agency, court or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See Systems of Records, NSF-50, "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," 63 Federal Register 267 (January 5, 1998), and NSF-51, "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records," 63 Federal Register 268 (January 5, 1998). Submission of the information is voluntary. Failure to provide full and complete information, however, may reduce the possibility of receiving an award.

Pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.5(b), an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to an information collection unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 3145-0058. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions. Send comments regarding this burden estimate and any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, Division of Administrative Services, National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA 22230, or to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for National Science Foundation (3145-0058), 725 17th Street, N.W. Room 10235, Washington, D.C. 20503.

OMB control number: 3145-0058.